1 (Case called)

2.3

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state your name for the record.

MS. FLODR: Good afternoon, your Honor. Aline Foldr on behalf of the United States, and with me at counsel table is Special Agent Aaron Spivack.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MS. GATTO: Good afternoon, your Honor. Federal Defenders of New York by Julia Gatto for Mr. Haverkamp.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

Good afternoon to you, Mr. Haverkamp.

So this matter is on for sentencing. Mr. Haverkamp pled guilty on June 15 before Magistrate Judge Gorenstein to receipt and distribution of child pornography and possession of child pornography, and I accepted that plea on June 29.

In connection with today's proceeding, I've reviewed the following submissions: The presentence investigation report which was revised as of December 7; Mr. Haverkamp's sentencing memorandum dated November 29 with various accompanying exhibits; the government's sentencing memorandum dated December 7 with an accompanying exhibit; and victim impact statements which were submitted on June 21, June 26, and September 25.

Have the parties received each of these submissions?

MS. FLODR: Yes, your Honor.

ICEC 48 1:17-cr-00509-RA Document 38 Filed 01/25/19 Page 3 of 31 1 MS. GATTO: Yes, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: So let's begin by discussing the 3 presentence report which was prepared by the United States 4 Probation Office. 5 Ms. Gatto, have you reviewed the presentence report and discussed it with your client? 6 7 MS. GATTO: I have, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Other than the five-point enhancement 9 pursuant to guideline Sentence 2G2.2(b)(5) which is discussed 10 at paragraph 54 of the presentence report, do you have any 11 other objections to the report? 12 MS. GATTO: I do not, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Haverkamp, have you read the 14 presentence report and had enough time to discuss it with your 15 attorney? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. 18 Does the government have any objections to the report? 19 MS. FLODR: No, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: So the Court adopts the factual findings 21 in the report. The presentence report will be made a part of 22 the record in this matter and placed under seal. If an appeal

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

Mr. Haverkamp, when you pled guilty in June, you

is taken, counsel on appeal may have access to the sealed

report without further application to the Court.

2.3

24

25

ICECES 1:17-cr-00509-RA Document 38 Filed 01/25/19 Page 4 of 31

discussed the federal sentencing guidelines with Magistrate Judge Gorenstein.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And as he noted then and as you know, they are a set of rules. They're published by the United States

Sentencing Commission. Just for those of you who don't know what they are, they are contained in this book here, and they're designed to guide judges when judges impose sentence.

Although at one time the guidelines were mandatory, meaning that judges were required to follow them, they're no longer binding on judges. But nonetheless, judges must consider them when determining an appropriate sentence.

So, Ms. Gatto, just to confirm, you agree with the guidelines calculation in the Pimentel letter; correct?

MS. GATTO: I do.

THE COURT: Do you want to be heard further on the applicability of the five-point enhancement?

MS. GATTO: Unless the Court wants to hear from me. I think the position is clear in our papers. But to the extent it isn't --

THE COURT: No. I think it is, and I understand that the government takes no position on it. Ultimately I think that there is insufficient evidence in the record to support the enhancement. So I'm not going to apply the enhancement.

In light of that conclusion, I do adopt the guidelines

range outlined in the Pimentel letter, and I find that
Mr. Haverkamp's offense level is 32, his criminal history
category is I, and his recommended guideline sentence is 121 to
151 months in prison.

As you know, there's a mandatory minimum sentence of 60 months, of five years. As I said a moment ago, the guidelines range is only advisory. Courts may impose a sentence outside of that range based on one of two legal concepts, a departure or a variance.

A departure allows for a sentence outside of the advisory range based on some provision of the guidelines themselves. I understand that the defendant is not seeking a departure but, rather, just a various pursuant to the factors set forth in 18 U.S. Code, Section 3553(a).

Is that right?

2.3

MS. GATTO: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Nonetheless, I've considered whether there is an appropriate basis for departure from the advisory range within the guidelines and conclude that no such grounds exist. I do though, as I said, have the power to impose a non-guideline sentence pursuant to a variance when I think it's appropriate to do so.

I'll hear from the parties now.

Would the government like to be heard with respect to sentencing?

2.3

MS. FLODR: Yes, your Honor, briefly. As the government has set out in its sentencing submission, the conduct at issue here, the offense conduct, is extremely serious.

This is one of those crimes that, you know, should be punished across the distribution chain, not just the people who actually produce and create this heinous material but also the people like Mr. Haverkamp who were responsible for distributing hundreds of these images and videos reflecting some of the worst, most egregious forms of child pornography in this case, including depictions of masochism and sadistic actions taken against prepubescent children.

In this case, moreover, after an electronic forensic review of his electronic devices, the FBI was able to find that Mr. Haverkamp spoke to over 70 other KIK users where there was evidence that he was discussing the distribution of child pornography with those users.

Unfortunately, we were never able to make sure or conclusively determine that he in fact did distribute, but there is evidence and admissions from the defendant himself where he did say that he also engaged individuals who identified themselves as young as 14 years old, 13-year-olds, to have them distribute child pornography to him, either already produced or of themselves.

So he also engaged, according to him, in the request

for the creation of new child pornography from these individuals that he was having these discussions with.

THE COURT: Can I just follow up on that.

So in your letter, you note that. So you say that the defendant admitted that he communicated with at least five minors from whom he requested pornography and to whom he may have sent nude pictures of himself.

MS. FLODR: Yes.

THE COURT: And then later, a couple lines later, you say: "Even more alarmingly, the defendant's interest in children went well beyond mere fantasy as the defendant self-reported having multiple contacts with young teenagers, including a 14-year-old girl he met on KIK, a 14-year-old boy that the defendant met in a school parking lot to engage in mutual masturbation, and a girl who he met online who had claimed to be 17 but ultimately turned out to be 13 years old."

Then it goes on to discuss the abuse of his stepbrother when he was 13 or 14, when Mr. Haverkamp was, and the child was two years old.

Just to be clear, aside from the 14-year-old boy or boy who appears to be 14 with whom he engaged in mutual masturbation, did he actually meet the 14-year-old girl and the 13-year-old girl? Did he meet them?

MS. FLODR: Give me one moment, your Honor, to confirm.

THE COURT: Sure. I'm sorry to interrupt. Are these people categorized in the group of five minors from whom he sought child pornography?

MS. FLODR: I believe it's the latter, your Honor, but let me confirm.

(Discussion off the record)

2.3

MS. FLODR: Your Honor, I have confirmed with Special Agent Aaron Spivack, and it's actually the only contact that he admitted to like in person was the 14-year-old boy and of course his stepbrother. The other two individuals that were listed in the sentence that your Honor just read were individuals that he engaged in these conversations online with.

THE COURT: That's what I thought. The way the sentence was structured, I just wanted to make sure that was accurate.

Please proceed.

MS. FLODR: Your Honor, I think that is the crux of the government's position as to why in this case we believe that although we have requested that based on other circumstances, that your Honor give a below-guideline sentence of below the 121 months, we also think that given the offense conduct in this case and the fact that this is distribution but distribution of the highest kind, of hundreds of images, as well as videos, we believe that a substantial term of imprisonment above the 60-month mandatory minimum is warranted

ICFC 45 9:17-cr-00509-RA Document 38 Filed 01/25/19 Page 9 of 31

1 | in this case.

2.3

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Do any victims wish to be heard? I've obviously read the victim impact statements, but do any victims wish to be heard today?

MS. FLODR: Your Honor, we have not heard from any victims. They have all been notified that this proceeding was happening today.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Ms. Gatto, would you like to be heard?

MS. GATTO: Yes, your Honor. Let me just start by pointing out that Mr. Haverkamp's mother has flown in from Michigan. She's here in the audience, along with the social worker from my office who's been working very closely with Mr. Haverkamp, as well as the paralegal who works on the case.

THE COURT: Thank you all for being here today.

MS. GATTO: What's important and what I would really like to focus on is the conduct is very serious, and there is no one on this side -- and I know that Mr. Haverkamp wants to speak directly to the Court about it. There is no one on this side that denies that. It's disturbing. It's serious. It's worthy of punishment. There is no question about that.

This is a case with a five-year mandatory minimum.

I'm sure the Court has seen cases similar, similar charges without that five-year mandatory minimum.

ICE 17-cr-00509-RA Document 38 Filed 01/25/19 Page 10 of 31

2.3

I think part of the five-year mandatory minimum is because the conduct is serious. His history does certainly go beyond just looking at material, and I think that the five-year mandatory minimum captures that.

What I'd like to focus on, and I think that this is important. You see this in lots of cases -- I have -- where there's a fragility to the human, a sickness, something that can be addressed. And there have been points in Mr. Haverkamp's life where I think there could have been intervention, and there was none.

He really -- he's needed treatment and counseling of a profound nature for a very long time. He was exhibiting troubling behavior at a very young age. He clearly wasn't processing difficult things that were happening in his life starting from when he himself was a minor, but it was repressed as a whole confluence of reasons why, and I'm not sure that we need to get into that.

I think the point is there has been no help for him, and this is an individual that is incredibly poised to take in help. And I want him desperately to talk to the Court because this is an individual — when you speak to him, it is clear he is very self-reflective. He is very thoughtful. He is very remorseful, and he's also very in need and able to take help.

THE COURT: It took an arrest to make him so self-reflective and thoughtful?

MS. GATTO: I think so. Maybe it is worthy to go through the reasons why he repressed it all. I think that because of his background, largely a very conservative Christian background, there was this lesson from early on, just push it down.

When you're pushing it that down, when it comes up, it comes up in really disgusting, awful ways. So, yes. I think that the solitariness of prison, the guidelines ranges that have been going from ten years to 210 months -- I think all of that process -- the FBI coming in and him sitting down. I know he'll talk about that moment with the Court.

All of that is yeah, I need help. He wasn't given outlets to turn to. I'm not saying that minimizes it. I'm not saying any of that. I'm just saying that this is someone who can be helped. And part of this system is not just punishment, but it's rehabilitation for two reasons. It's for him and for the public.

We keep individuals in jail for incapacitation to protect the public but also to make them in a place where they can go back and reenter safely, transition. And this individual is going to be able to do that.

He has not been receiving sex offender specific treatments right now because they're not available at the MCC. Yet he's still trying to take advantage of everything he can. He has worked more closely with my social workers than any

individual I've been working with.

2.3

He participates in all the activities -- journaling, diary writing, counseling sessions with them. He's the one who said to me, can you give me more information about what the sex offender treatment programs in the BOP look like. And it's the first time I've really dug deep into them.

THE COURT: I was going to ask a question about that.

You referenced in your letter that he won't get treatment, that kind of treatment, until the last three years of his sentence.

Is that right?

MS. GATTO: Yes.

THE COURT: So if he's sent to a place like Butner, you've confirmed that he won't actually get any kind of treatment, sex offender treatment, until the last three years of his sentence?

MS. GATTO: Butner, there's treatment, but it's not sex offender specific, your Honor. It's not the inpatient program. So the inpatient program that is designed exactly for the frailty that is at the base here is not at Butner. It's at Devens and Marion. And that is only available in the last three years, and it's an intensive three year program.

Will he receive no treatment? Hopefully he'll get mental health treatment, but it's going to be far more generic. I'm not saying it won't be useful.

THE COURT: Even at the facilities where there's a

ICEX#2VS.17-cr-00509-RA Document 38 Filed 01/25/19 Page 13 of 31

large population of sex offenders?

2.3

MS. GATTO: I don't know if their mental health counseling is now being focused on that, but it's certainly not sex offender specific treatment.

Now, they may -- I know that there are other facilities where there's a lodger population of sex offenders.

As that population grows in more general population facilities, if their counselors are responding, that I certainly haven't confirmed, and I don't know.

But the sex offender specific programs that have been designed for sex offenders when they're in or out that are designed to go to the roots that you sometimes universally, those are only at Devens and Marion. They're inpatient programs, and they're only available for the last three years.

I think it's very compelling, your Honor, that there could be -- our proposal, which is a very significant sentence -- five years is not a short period of time.

This is an individual whose never been in jail. This is certainly an individual who has issues, who's committed crimes, who has certainly on the ledger of wrongfulness things to report but also on the ledger of worthiness things to report.

He's always been employed. He was married. He has relationships in the communities that I think speak to his character. He's involved in volunteering even at the prison.

ICE 17-cr-00509-RA Document 38 Filed 01/25/19 Page 14 of 31

2.3

As soon as he got in there, he got himself on the suicide watch team which is a work detail different than the kitchen. It's much more emotional. It's something he's really derived value out of helping other humans.

So for this individual, I don't want to minimize and just say, oh, just because I'm asking for the mandatory minimum, this isn't a long term. It is a longer term of imprisonment.

THE COURT: It is a long term. He's young. So even if he got a guideline sentence, if he got good time, he'd be out in his 30's.

MS. GATTO: Sure, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm not minimizing the length of that sentence in any way. I'm just putting it in the perspective of how old he is. But I agree with you a hundred percent that a five-year sentence is a long sentence.

MS. GATTO: Yes. And it's I think also helpful always for my clients to hear that there's hope, to know that you're going to get out when you're still young. But that's the thing that I have really watched in Mr. Haverkamp which I admire is this is an optimistic, hopeful person, a realist who has expressed multiple times, I need help. I want help. I don't want to return to this behavior.

A sentence of five years in jail, all of the rest of it, which will be spent in an intensive program that is

designed for someone with these issues and then five years of supervised release to go immediately from the inpatient program focused treatment to transitioning into the community with outpatient, with monitoring devices, which is the kind of seamless transition from the inpatient to the outpatient setting, what we're asking for, your Honor, would be -- it's going to be eight years of treatment, the sentence I'm proposing, five of those being spent in an incarceratory setting and the rest spent on supervision.

So it is a minimal sentence when you look at all of the reasons we sentence someone, including punishment, incapacitation. But it's a meaningful sentence when we look at the purposes of rehabilitation and what that means for deterrence, specific deterrence, and protecting the public.

So I've thought long and hard. I know these cases are difficult for a million reasons, a million reasons, including that the guidelines don't really, as the Second Circuit has recognized, provide the same kind of guidance it does in other cases because the numbers are so high. Sometimes we lose sight when we see what high numbers, what a proportionate sentence is.

Having said all that, your Honor, I think that five years is sufficient but not greater than necessary.

THE COURT: All right. I just have one question about your letter, your submission.

It seems like you said a number of times that he's not a pedophile, and I don't think we need to debate exactly what that means and if he is or if he isn't. But he clearly has sexual interest in children, and even the report noted his sexual interest in and arousal with respect to an eight-year-old girl and even after noting the results of the Abel assessment, noted that it doesn't explain his track record of seeming sexual interest in children.

MS. GATTO: I think absolutely it's always hard, but it's hard to understand his Abel results with the conduct, but what I really think is happening here — and this is supported by Dr. Prenky (phonetic) and our social workers' evaluation — is that this is somebody who was participating in the possession and distribution of child pornography, participating in the online community of people who were exchanging this stuff, less because of a sexual interest, but there's a confused sexuality component of course, but more this community, this idea of someone who was socially inept finding a place of what he would call deviants like himself online.

It is less about a desire to do the things he sees, to do the things that other people in those chatrooms are talking about, and more the desire to feel accepted because he's always felt different. He's always been embarrassed and shamed by his sexuality because of the various constellation of events from his childhood. And it's less about his desire to engage in

ICEASE 17-cr-00509-RA Document 38 Filed 01/25/19 Page 17 of 31

1 | sexual contact with a minor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: Although he has engaged in sexual contact with a minor.

MS. GATTO: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I know. Thank you.

Mr. Haverkamp, I'm happy to hear anything you'd like to say today.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Judge Abrams.

I want to say that what I did was wrong. My conduct was disgusting; disgraceful; and most of all, hurtful. I want to express my remorse to all the people that I have hurt.

I'm here today to tell you that I will never commit this behavior again. I just have nothing but regret for my actions, and knowing how much I hurt the people closest to me, I never want to hurt them again. And I never want to hurt anyone else in the future.

Along with that, I also want to let you know that I don't ever want to go back to the person who I used to be before that morning when the FBI came in my door. I was ignoring my problems, I wasn't taking responsibility, and I wasn't making efforts to get better.

Even though that morning was rock bottom for me, since then, I have just been trying as hard as I possibly can to take responsibility and to seek out treatment and, with treatment, to start working with those skills, making them part of my

ICEX#2VS.17-cr-00509-RA Document 38 Filed 01/25/19 Page 18 of 31

daily routine, and try to get better.

Now that I've been spending weekly sessions with a social worker, I have been noticing some improvement. I know that I still have a long way to go. I feel that I would benefit from more therapy and more intensive programming for sex offenders.

I know that I need to stay with this and not just through the remainder of my prison time, but I need to stay with this treatment and counseling long after and beyond the supervised release and even beyond then.

I know that I have so much more work to do, but I know that not only do I owe it to the people that I hurt, but I owe it to myself to get better, and I never want to go back to the person who ignores problems.

That's just what I wanted you to know today, that what I did was absolutely wrong. My iconic was terrible, and I will always regret it. But at the same time, knowing that I've started to improve with my mental health, as well as my physical and spiritual health, I just don't want to go back to where I was before.

I like the improvement that I've already been making, and I just want to keep on going down that right path so I can return to society, be a functioning member of my community.

And I want to be a healthy person.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

2.3

I hope what you said is true. I hope you continue to participate in this kind of not only self-reflection but therapy and other programs that may be of assistance, and I hope that they ultimately are of assistance.

So in imposing sentence, I'm required to consider the advisory guidelines range of 121 to 151 months in prison, but I cannot and do not presume that a guideline sentence is reasonable. Rather, I must make my own independent review of the factors that are outlined in a provision of the law. It's 18 U.S. Code, Section 3553(a), and I have done so.

Those factors include but are not limited to the nature and circumstances of the offense and the personal history and characteristics of the defendant.

Judges are also required to consider the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, provide just punishment for the offense, afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, protect the public from future crimes of the defendant, and avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities among other things.

So first I've considered the nature and circumstances of the offense which I think we all agree is undoubtedly a serious one. In the month alone when Mr. Haverkamp was corresponding with the undercover officer, he exchanged over 400 messages and sent approximately 35 images and video files depicting the sexual abuse and exploitation of prepubescent

ICE 17-cr-00509-RA Document 38 Filed 01/25/19 Page 20 of 31

children including infants and toddlers.

Among the many horrific images of the ones that I viewed are the ones of a child aged one to two wearing a diaper with an adult man forcing his erect penis in her mouth and of a six- to eight-year-old tied to a pole with a red gag ball in her mouth.

Mr. Haverkamp was trading these images, the memorialization of rape and molestation and abuse of the most vulnerable among us like they were baseball cards.

I've read the victim impact statements from the victims depicted in some of these images who describe not only how the initial abuse by their family members or caretakers or other people in their lives who abused their trust had that initial abuse not only destroyed their lives, but how they feel victimized all over again every day by people like

Mr. Haverkamp who pass along these images, these videos and images of the torment of these children for their enjoyment.

In my view, a serious sentence must be imposed to provide just punishment and to try and deter others from keeping this grotesque market -- to keep it from staying alive.

The defendant also sent photos of his minor nieces and nephews, albeit clothed, to the undercover to continue conversations about engaging in hands-on contact with children.

In asking that he be sentenced to the full extent of the law, the mother of three of those children, the sister of

ICE 28 VS 17-cr-00509-RA Document 38 Filed 01/25/19 Page 21 of 31

his wife, noted that while she doesn't believe that he physically abused her children, he often sought to be alone with her children who are now aged nine, seven, and two.

After a search warrant was executed, Mr. Haverkamp admitted to trading in child pornography with approximately 50 other individuals and exchanging over 20 cloud links with child pornography.

According to the presentence report, the FBI has identified over 70 KIK users with whom he had thousands of lines of chat and to whom it appears that he distributed child pornography. That said, we don't know the full scope of the defendant's conduct because he deleted the KIK accounts before the FBI executed its search.

Even more troubling, Mr. Haverkamp admitted to sexually abusing his two-year-old stepbrother when he himself was 13 or 14; to engaging in what was described as mutual masturbation with a boy he believed to be 14 when he, Mr. Haverkamp, was 25; as well as to communicating with at least five minors online from whom he requested nude pictures encouraging them to create their own child pornography.

In light of this conduct, the sentence imposed must reflect the seriousness of the offense; afford adequate deterrence, both specific and general; and protect the public from future crimes of this defendant.

I've also considered all of the arguments made by

defense counsel, including that this is Mr. Haverkamp's first criminal conviction; that he has accepted responsibility for his crimes.

He appears to be genuinely remorseful, which I don't doubt; that he's interested in improving himself and in rehabilitating himself, which I also don't doubt at this moment in time.

And I'll also note that while he's been at the MCC, he's volunteered to be a companion to incarcerated individuals on suicide watch and is tutoring individuals who are studying for their GED, and those are all impressive activities and good things to be doing.

I've read the letters submitted by family and friends and members of the defendant's community. I've considered not only the obstacles Mr. Haverkamp faced growing up, but I've considered the collateral consequences of being designated a sex offender.

Finally, I've considered the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities, and I've reviewed the cases cited by the defendant. I'll just note, however, that this circuit has approved numerous sentences for possession and distribution of child pornography akin to the one within this guidelines range, including those which didn't involve in-person or even any contact with children. See e.g. *United States v. Forrest*, 639 F. App'x 30 at 34. That's the Circuit from 2016 affirming a

sentence of 151 months for a defendant who was convicted of distributing child pornography where his personal history did not include sexual contact with children.

United States v. Light, 2018 WL 6179010 at 1. That's the Circuit from 2018 affirming a sentence of 151 months' imprisonment which was within the guidelines range for a defendant convicted of child pornography possession where the defendant did not have contact with any children.

And United States v. Pulsifer, 469 F. App'x 41 at 43, the Circuit in 2012 affirming a sentence of 121 months' imprisonment for transporting and distributing child pornography where the defendant's only sexual contact with children was over a webcam. So I've considered all those factors, and I am ready to impose sentence.

Mr. Haverkamp, could you please rise.

It's the judgment of this Court that you be committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 121 months on each count to run concurrently to be followed by a term of supervised release of five years on each count also to run concurrently.

I believe this sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes of sentencing set forth in the law. If you'd like, you can be seated while I read the conditions of your supervised release, as well as the other details of your sentence.

ICE 25 17-cr-00509-RA Document 38 Filed 01/25/19 Page 24 of 31

2.3

All the standard conditions of supervised release shall apply. They're on page 32 and 33 of the presentence report. I'm not going to read them aloud unless someone wants me to.

The mandatory conditions of supervised release shall apply. You must not commit another federal, state, or local crime. You must refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance.

The probation department recommends that the drug testing condition be suspended based on its determination that you're a low risk of future substance abuse. So I'll suspend that normally mandatory condition.

You must cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer. And you must comply with the requirements of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act, 42 U.S. Code, Section 16901, as directed by the probation officer, the Bureau of Prisons, or any state sex offender registration agency in which you reside, work, are a student, or were convicted of a qualifying offense.

In addition, the probation department recommends certain special conditions of supervised release. I'm going to impose some but not all of them.

So you'll be supervised in the district of your residence. You must not have deliberate contact with any child under 18 years of age unless approved by the probation

ICEX: 17-cr-00509-RA Document 38 Filed 01/25/19 Page 25 of 31

1 department.

2.3

You must not loiter within 100 feet of schoolyards, playgrounds, arcades, or other places primarily used by children under the age of 18.

In addition, you must undergo a sex offense specific evaluation and participate in an outpatient sex offender treatment and/or outpatient mental health treatment program approved by the United States Probation Office.

You must abide by all rules, requirements, and conditions of the sex offender treatment program, including submission to polygraph testing.

You must waive your right of confidentiality in any records for mental health assessment and treatment imposed as a consequence of this judgment to allow the probation officer to review your course of treatment and progress with the treatment provider.

You must contribute to the cost of services rendered based on your ability to pay and the availability of third-party payments.

The Court authorizes the release of available psychological and psychiatric evaluations and reports, including the presentence investigation report, to the sex offender treatment provider and/or mental health treatment provider.

You must submit your person, residence, place of

2.3

business, vehicle, and any property, computers as defined in 18 U.S. Code, Section 1030(e)(1), electronic communications, data storage devices and/or other media under your control to a search on the basis that the probation officer has reasonable suspicion that contraband or evidence of a violation of the conditions of your supervised release may be found.

This search must be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner. Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation. You must inform any other residents that the premises may be subject to search pursuant to this condition.

Finally, with respect to the conditions of your supervised release, you must participate in the computer Internet monitoring program administered by the U.S. Probation Office.

You must provide the U.S. Probation office advance notification of any computers, automated services, or connected devices that will be used during the term of supervision and that can access the Internet.

The U.S. Probation Office is authorized to install any application that's necessary to survey all activity on computers or connected devices owned or operated by you.

You may be required to pay the cost and monitoring services at the monthly rate provided by the U.S. probation officer. The rate and payment schedule are subject to periodic

ICE 17-cr-00509-RA Document 38 Filed 01/25/19 Page 27 of 31

adjustments by the U.S. Attorney's Office.

2.3

The U.S. Probation Office shall be notified via electronic transmission of impermissible suspicious activity or communications occurring on such computer or connected device consistent with the computer monitoring policy in effect by the probation officer as triggered by impermissible suspicious activity. You must consent to and cooperate with unannounced examinations of any computer equipment owned or used by you.

The examination shall include but is not limited to retrieval and copying of all data from the computer, connected devices, storage media, and any internal or external peripherals and may involve removing of such equipment for the purpose of conducting a more thorough inspection.

I'm going to impose the fine under the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015. So that's \$5,000 per count. So that's a \$10,000 fine. Unless there's an objection from the parties, I'll order the schedule.

Is the government proposing a particular schedule for this, or is there one in the PSR?

MS. FLODR: Your Honor, are you speaking about the fine or the restitution?

THE COURT: I was actually just talking about the fine for the time being. I think restitution you wanted some additional time; is that right?

MS. FLODR: Yes, your Honor. We do not have a

schedule, and I don't think it's included as far as I saw for the fine in the PSR.

THE COURT: Is there any one you would propose?

MS. FLODR: Your Honor, I don't have a schedule to propose for this.

THE COURT: Do you have a request with respect to the fine, Ms. Gatto? If not, I just won't put anything in there for now.

MS. GATTO: I don't.

2.3

THE COURT: I'm required to impose the mandatory special assessment of \$200 or fee, and that shall be paid immediately.

As I said, I understand that the parties are trying to work out an agreement with respect to restitution. So why don't you get back to me on that within 30 days if you could. And if we need to have a hearing, we'll do that.

The government is not seeking forfeiture in addition to restitution. Is that correct?

MS. FLODR: Your Honor, we are in fact seeking forfeiture. We have handed up a preliminary order of forfeiture that has been signed by our office.

THE COURT: I see it now. I'm sorry. I had not seen it. So just give me a minute to read that.

(Pause)

THE COURT: I'll just note for the record that it's a

ICEXISEVIS17-cr-00509-RA Document 38 Filed 01/25/19 Page 29 of 31

consent preliminary order of forfeiture.

2.3

I'll just note that I'm going to make this consent preliminary order of forfeiture part of the judgment. In it, among other things, the defendant is consenting to the forfeiture of all his right, title, and interest in the following specific property: One HTC cellular telephone.

Actually, two HTC cellular telephones, and they bear different serial numbers. This constitutes property obtained from the offenses or property used or intended to be used to commit the offenses charged in Counts One and Two of the indictment. I'm going to sign off on this as well.

Does either counsel know of any legal reason why this sentence cannot be imposed as stated?

MS. FLODR: No, your Honor.

MS. GATTO: Your Honor, for purposes of the record, we think that this sentence is far greater than necessary, but other than that, no, your Honor.

THE COURT: That's the sentence of this Court. You have a right to appeal your conviction and sentence,

Mr. Haverkamp, except to whatever extent you may have validly waived that right as part of your plea agreement.

If you do choose to appeal, the notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the judgment of conviction. If you're not able to pay for the costs of an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis which simply means

2.3

that court costs such as filing fees will be waived. If you request, the clerk of court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf.

Are there any open counts or underlying indictments that need to be dismissed?

MS. FLODR: No, your Honor, not at this time. But one minor correction to the record. Mr. Haverkamp did not plead guilty pursuant to a plea agreement. He pled guilty pursuant to a Pimentel.

THE COURT: That is correct. So thank you for clarifying that.

So there are no limits on your right to appeal, and that should be clear for the record.

Mr. Haverkamp, as I said, I view this conduct as very serious, but I meant what I said. I hope that this self-reflection that you spoke about and the work that you're doing and the work that you will do when you're in more formal treatment is really helpful to you.

I hope you're able to turn your life around and avoid contact with any of this kind of material and, in particular, any contact with children that may endanger them. But I wish you luck with that effort.

Are there any other applications?

MS. FLODR: No, your Honor.

MS. GATTO: Your Honor, if you can make a